

REMARKS

At the outset, the courtesies extended by the Examiner in granting the 3 August 2004 interview, and the professionalism he demonstrated during that interview, are appreciatively noted. During the interview, the reference cited by the Examiner was discussed in light of clarifying amendments proposed to the Claims by the undersigned Attorney as forth herein.

Responsive to the 19 May 2004 Office Action and the discussions had at the interview, independent Claims 1, 11, and 21 are further amended for continued prosecution with the other pending Claims. It is believed that such amendments further clarify the Claims' recitations.

In the 19 May 2004 Office Action, the Examiner again rejected Claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Logan, et al. reference. The Examiner reiterated the basis for rejection set forth in the first Office Action.

As Applicants' newly-amended independent Claims 1, 11, and 21 each now more clearly recite, Applicants' claimed system and method include among their combinations of features such features as the operable coupling of first and second units "over a direct wireless link," and the preconfigured operation of such units "in proximity-responsive manner." Transmission of appropriate data is thereby effected over the wireless link "automatically," "without user intervention," as each independent Claim further clarifies.

Clearly, the cited Logan, et al. reference fails to either to disclose or suggest the full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicants' pending Claims. Note in this regard that Logan, et al. is generally directed to a broadcast-like program distribution system which necessarily contemplates user intervention to invoke downloads of the desired programs from those 'broadcast' over the internet (or through some other such 'broadcast' medium). The reference explains that its upload/download sequences are initiated when "an interested subscriber invokes programming services by first supplying" various information. It specifies, moreover, that the server's compilation of the files for download is "[b]ased on the information supplied by the user" in this manner (Column 7; Lines 8-9 and 16).

The reference nowhere discloses actuating any download "automatically" across "a direct wireless link," between the given units, "without user intervention;" much less doing so "in proximity-responsive manner" (as recited in newly-amended independent Claims 1, 11, and 21). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Logan, et al. fails to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicants' pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

It is believed that the subject Patent Application has now been placed fully
in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 8/4/2004

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678